

REMARKS

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application. Claims 1-4, 7-14, and 17-20 are pending. Claims 5, 6, 15, and 16 were previously cancelled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein. Claims 2 and 12 are amended. Claims 1 and 11 are independent. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein.

Reasons for Entry of Amendments

At the outset, it is respectfully requested that this Amendment be entered into the Official File in view of the fact that, as argued below, independent claims 1 and 11 as currently written contain allowable subject matter, and thus all claims of the present application are in condition for allowance.

In the alternative, if the Examiner does not agree that this application is in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that this Amendment be entered for the purpose of appeal. This Amendment was not presented at an earlier date in view of the fact that the Examiner has just now presented new grounds of rejection in this Final Office Action.

Drawings

The Examiner has not indicated whether the drawings are accepted. Clarification in the next official communication is respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-4, 7-14 and 17-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mishimagi et al. (U.S. 6,880,960).

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Arguments Regarding Independent Claims 1 and 11

The Applicant respectfully submits that each of independent claims 1 and 11 as currently written contains novel subject matter not taught or suggested by the reference cited by the Examiner.

Each of independent claims and 11 as currently written recites a combination of elements directed to a rear view mirror assembly, including *inter alia*

wherein the first lens is larger than the second lens, so as to encompass a substantial part of a periphery of the second lens.

Support for the novel features set forth in claims 1 and 11 can be seen, for example, in FIG. 4.

According to the present invention, the first lens encompasses a substantial part of a periphery of the second lens. Therefore, the mirror assembly is more compact. Since the first lens borders on the second lens, it is possible for light emitting from the turn indicator light to pass through the second lens. Accordingly, the size of the first lens lighting area is not

decreased even though the second lens enters into the first lens area. Thus, the make mirror assembly is more compact while maintaining a large area of light.

Mishimagi et al. merely disclose the first lens and the second lens fitted into the through holes of the mirror cover body, but fails to disclose the features that the first lens encompasses a substantial part of a periphery of the second lens, as presently claimed. Thus, it is impossible for Mishimagi et al. to make a compact mirror assembly through the second lens light emitting from the turn indicator light. Thus, Mishimagi et al. cannot achieve the effect of the present invention.

Thus, the Mishimagi et al. document fails to suggest wherein the first lens is larger than the second lens, so as to encompass a substantial part of a periphery of the second lens (as set forth in each of independent claims 1 and 11).

The Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of elements as set forth in each of independent claims 1 and 11 is not disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record, including Mishimagi et al., at least for the reason explained above.

Therefore, independent claims 1 and 11 are in condition for allowance.

The Examiner will note that dependent claims 2 and 12 are amended to set forth additional novel features of the present invention.

All dependent claims are in condition for allowance due to their dependency from allowable independent claims, or due to the additional novel features set forth therein.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Since the remaining patents cited by the Examiner have not been utilized to reject claims, but merely to show the state of the art, no comment need be made with respect thereto.

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and that the present application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, he is invited to telephone Carl T. Thomsen (Reg. No. 50,786) at (703) 205-8000. If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17, particularly extension of time fees.

Dated: November 8, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

James M. Slattery

Registration No.: 28,380

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Rd, Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorneys for Applicant